(Mr. Speaker)

Is it the pleasure of the Assembly that permission be granted to Sri A. S. Dudhya Naik for remaining absent from all the meetings of the Assembly?

Hon'ble Members.—Yes.

Mr. Speaker.—Permission to remain absent is granted.

I have received a letter from Sri D. T. Seetharama Rao, another Hon'ble Member of this House, requesting leave of absence from 13th March and onwards from all the meetings of the current session as he has been deputed to undergo training in Community Development at Mussoorie.

Is it the pleasure of the Assembly that permission be granted to Sri D. T. Seetharama Rao for remaining absent from all the meetings of the Assembly?

Hon'ble Members.—Yes.

Mr. Speaker.—Permission to remain absent is granted.

MOTION FOR ELECTION TO THE SENATE OF THE MYSORE UNIVERSITY.

Sri B. D. Jatti. (Chief Minister).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect six members to the Senate of the Mysore University according to the principle of proportional representation by means of single transferable vote as required under Section 15 of the Mysore University Act, 1956".

Mr. Speaker.—The question is:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect six members to the Senate of the Mysore University according to the principle of proportionate representation by means of single transferable vote as required under Section 15 of the Mysore University Act, 1956".

The motion was adopted.

MEMBER'S REPRESENTATION

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಓಟ್ ಆನ್ ಅಕಾಂಟ್ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರೊಗ್ರಾಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಮಗೆ ಈ ಓಟ್ ಆನ್ ಅಕಾಂಟ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವಾಗ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದು. ಈಗತಾನೆ ಅದು ಬಂದಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಯಾವ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಿಸಿದ್ದೀವೆಯೋ ಅವನ್ನೇ ಪುನಃ ಪುನಃ ಏಕೆ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿಬೇಕೋ ತಿಳಿಯದು. ಹಿಂದೆ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯವನ್ನೇ ಈ ಸಲ ಅನುಸರಿಸಲು ನಿರಾಕರಿಸುತ್ತಿರುವಂತಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ (ನಂಜನಗೂಡು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆ ನಮ್ಮ Rules of procedure ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಓಟ್ ಅನ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ.

"170 (2) : Amendments may be moved for the reduction of the whole grant or for the reduction or omission of the items whereof the grant is composed.

(3) Discussion of a general character shall be allowed on the motion or any amendments moved thereto, but the details of the grant shall not be discussed further than is necessary to develop the general points.

(4) In other respects, a motion for vote on acconnt shall be dealt with in the same way as if it were a demand for grant."

ಈ ರೀತಿ ರೂಲ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಈಗ ತಾನೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಕೈಗೆ ಈ ಓಟ್ ಆನ್ ಅಕಾಂಟಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಪ್ರೊಪ್ರಿಯೇಷನ್ ಬಿಲ್ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾವು ಯಾವಾಗ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬೇಕು ? ತಾವು ಕರ್ಟೆಷ್ಯ ವಿಚಾರ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಆ ಕರ್ಟೆಷ್ಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸುವ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂತ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಕ್ಕು ಏನಾಯಿತು. ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Even last time, I do remember that the Vote on Account came before the House and I made the remark that it was a very formal affair and that normally no discussion would take place and it was agreed to last time by no less a person than Sri Mallaradhya. If I remember right, he even said that he would make his remarks on the Budget instead of on Vote on Account.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ನಾನು ಆ ಮಾತನ್ನೇ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ರೂಲ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಪ್ರೊವೈಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದೆ. ತಾವು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಇಂಟರ್‌ಪ್ರೆಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ ? ಆದರೆ ತಾವು ನಮಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಮೊಟಕು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಾನೇನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ಕರ್ಟೆಷ್ಯ 1958 ರಿಂದಲೂ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—We are getting wise sir, day by day.

Mr. SPEAKER.—To go against our own conventions, I do not know whether it is a wise thing.

†Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I think the point seems to have been missed. While it may be true that Mr. Mallaradhya might have denied himself the opportunity to make his remarks on Vote on Account, the point that is now sought to be raised is whether there is not a right as such accruing to Members to send in amendments to the vote on account motion. That is something different from what the Hon'ble Speaker is trying to say. I think Mr. Mallaradhya agreed to the former, not to the latter.

† Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—The question of convention arises only in the absence of definite rules framed. When there are definite rules framed there can be no question of convention and the rules must be observed. Specially when this rule has been framed recently, it might be that there were some conventions when rules were not so specific. But conventions are over-ridden by Rules. Therefore, I do not believe that there was a convention for asking Members to speak about the Vote on Account without giving that opportunity to make amendments or devote their attention to the subject. On the other hand, today there is absolutely no doubt about the procedure to be adopted and when the procedure is definitely prescribed under the Rules, there is no scope for conventions. I therefore request the Chair to kindly allow some time to the Members to table their amendments and the vote on account may be taken up tomorrow or the day after.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I must say that these Rules have been in operation for the last two years. In spite of these Rules, we have established a convention that the Vote on Account should not be discussed because it covers the same ground as that of the Budget. Of course there is a right to table amendments, but if amendments are tabled and moved in the House, naturally discussion takes place. That means it will be going against our own conventions. I have no objection if members want to go against the convention. But is it wise for them to go against the convention ? I tell them one thing. Rule 170 gives them the right to move amendments and discuss the Vote on Account. These Rules have been in operation during the last two years or more. They have taken no objection whatever and there is a convention that has been established. These Rules have been copied from the Lok Sabha. As far as I am aware in the Lok Sabha, no debate on Vote on Account takes place in spite of these rules. Rules give certain rights to Members and Members in turn choose to give up these rights by adopting a sort of convention. I hope the Hon'ble Members understand me when I say that there can be conventions established when they deny themselves the right given to them by the Rules. There can be a convention, and we can adhere to that convention. Otherwise, they can have a full discussion here and I have no objection. But I must at the same time tell the Hon'ble Members that if they want time now, the time allotted for the Budget discussion will be entitled and those who take part in the discussion on Vote on Account will not be allowed to take part in the discussion on the Budget, because it covers the same ground.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, nobody is anxious to hear his own voice. This is not the stand which the Hon'ble Speaker should take. It is not a case of punishing the Members because they want to exercise their rights under the Rules. I do not know that sort of a ruling can be given at all.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not punishing anybody at all. I am only trying to avoid repetition.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Vote on Account is quite a different thing compared to the actual discussion on the Budget. The Speaker is giving a ruling that those who take part in discussion on Vote on Account will not be permitted to take part in the actual discussion on the Budget. That is not the sort of ruling that I expected from the Chair. I want to know whether you will give us time to move amendments and if so, how long you will give us time to table amendments?

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Without even some preliminary discussion on the Budget, how can this Vote on Account be taken up, Sir ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not able to understand him Vote on Account comes up only because we are not able to finish the Budget discussion in time, and it is only a question of giving money to the Government just to carry on till the Budget is passed. I have seen in the House of Commons; they do not take more than five minutes. I have also seen in the Bombay Assembly, they do not take more than five minutes. Don't think for a moment that these rule were not there. These rules were there. Even in the Lok Sabha the same rules are there. I have no objection if the Members want to go back and insist upon rules being observed.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—I am only saying that conventions must have some antiquity. Whatever we did yesterday, cannot become convention today.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all conventions and precedents that we are adopting are conventions and precedents of the House of Commons. That is clear under the articles of the Constitution.

†Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—The conventions that are being observed here may be conventions adopted in the House of Commons. But that conception applies only when there are no specific rules of our own. When we have got Rules we have got to observe these rules. The conventions that were observed during the last two years might have been under circumstances. Supposing for arguments sake during the previous year, if the Hon'ble Members have not sent amendments, and they did not give sufficient time for the subject, that would not be a convention. On the other hand, my submission is that time should have been given.

2-00 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I understand that he wants me to stick to the Rules of Procedure. If Hon'ble Members insist that rule 170 in regard to the vote on account should be observed; I have absolutely no objection. I have said that from the beginning, but at the same time I have also said that they should consider why they want to go back upon the convention that has been established. I may tell them that by this departure they may harm themselves by going back upon the convention. It is not much that they gain here. On the other hand they will gain

(Mr. SPEAKER)

much at the time of discussion on the budget because they will have full discussion. This vote on account is meant only just to carry on the administration. So, I appeal to Members to think well before making a departure from the convention. It may happen that this will harm their interest. Once they accept a convention there must be very grave reasons to go back upon it. If in spite of this they want me to stick to rule 170 I have no objection.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What is the harm that will happen ?

Mr SPEAKER.—It is not for me to say now.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Many a time you have given the ruling that as against an existing rule a convention cannot have priority.

Mr. SPEAKER.---I have not changed that position. If he insists on the rule, convention has no place.

They can send amendments by tomorrow. We will take up the next item now. At the same time I am very sorry that the conventions that have been established in this House are being torpedoed.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—What is the convention ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The convention is to pass the Vote on Account without debate.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—If that is the convention it can be passed in 2 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That have has always been done so in Bombay.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—It is not a question of convention. It is a right given to the executive to get a Vote on Account under article 206, but that is taken only in certain circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am very sorry that a member who has worked in Assemblies must take up such an attitude. Anyhow, the questian is now settled. The 'vote on account' will be taken up to-morrow or some other day. By to-morrow they can send the amendments.

BUDGET ESTIMATE FOR 1961-62.

General Discussion.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ. (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರು ಮಂಡಿಸಿರುವ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್, ಅವರ ವಾದದಪ್ರಕಾರವೇ, hopeless budget ಎನ್ನುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಅಂಕಿಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚುಕಡಮೆ ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟು, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಇರುವನ್ಯೂನತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಒಬ್ಬ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ವಕೀಲರು ಒಂದು ಕೇಸಿನಿಂದ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿಹೊರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ವಾದಮಾಡುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರು ಅವರ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಸ್ಪಾರಸ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಕ್ಲಿಷ್ಟಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗಳಿಂದ ಪಾರಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನೇನು ವಾದಮಾಡಬಹುದೋ ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಬಹಳ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ವಾದಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.